UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,079	08/01/2006	Edith Sorensen	P30006	3993
	7590 08/03/201 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.0	EXAMINER		
1950 ROLAND	CLARKE PLACE	KENNEDY, NICOLETTA		
RESTON, VA	20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1611	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/03/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/582,079	SORENSEN, EDITH	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Nicoletta Refilledy	1011	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 July 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ater thán SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	otod olamio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / monamone (	102 02 1/1
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).		<b>,</b>	<b>g</b>
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1.3-15 and 22-29.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>16-21</u> .  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ul> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ul>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>7/19/10</u>		
/N. K./	/Anne R Kubelik/		
Examiner, Art Unit 1611	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1638	
	i imary Examinor, Art o	1000	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims remain rejected under the grounds of rejection used in the final office action dated June 3, 2010.

Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive. As an initial matter, Applicant states that the examiner should consider copending application 10/582,223. While the examiner has reviewed the prosecution history of this application, Applicant is reminded that each case is examined on its merits.

Applicant then argues that the object of the composition of Tame-Said is to prevent periodontal diseases, not to whiten teeth. This is an intended use that does not structurally limit the claimed composition. The claim requires that calcium pyrophosphate be present and the examiner has provided rationale for substituting calcium pyrophosphate for tricalcium phosphate. The rationale is based on the simple substitution of one known tooth polishing agent for another. Additionally, as previously stated by the examiner, modifying the amount of polishing agent is not inventive. While the examiner appreciates Applicant's remarks regarding teeth whitening, the motivation for substitution in prior art references does not need to match the motive of applicant for combination in the instant claims. The fact that such a combination would have been within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art, irrespective of the reason for combination, is sufficient to establish a case of prima facie obviousness.